

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the present application. The Office Action dated June 14, 2005 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 6, 9, 11-15 and 17 have been amended, claim 19 has been added, and claim 5 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-4 and 6-19 are pending in the application with claims 4 and 8 being withdrawn from consideration. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection and rejections in view of the above amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Publication No. 2002/0101547, issued to Lee et al. (hereafter "Lee"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because Lee fails to teach each and every feature recited in the claims of the present application. In particular, Lee fails to teach or suggest a method for fabricating an in-plane switching mode liquid crystal display panel that includes "forming a liquid crystal display panel by attaching the first substrate to the second substrate; and subsequently providing a discharging device for removing an electrostatic charge from the liquid crystal display panel" as recited in independent claim 9 from which claims 13 and 14 depend.

Applicants respectfully note that Lee teaches "electrostatic charging circuits, which charge the electrostatic charges and extinguish the same, are formed on a TFT substrate" (see, paragraph [0018]) Also, "Electrostatic charges... are dispersed by the shorting bar 102" (see, paragraph 0151)). However, Lee fails to teach "forming a liquid crystal display panel by attaching the first substrate to the second substrate; and subsequently providing a discharging device for removing an electrostatic charge from the liquid crystal display panel" as recited in the claims of the present application. Because Lee fails to teach at least this feature of independent claim 9, claim 9 and its dependent claims 13 and 14 are allowable over Lee. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,853,435, issued to Tanaka et al. (hereafter "Tanaka"). And, claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Lee and Tanaka in view of the M. Ohta et al. article (hereafter “Ohta article”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections because neither Lee, Tanaka nor the Ohta article, analyzed alone or in any combination, teaches or suggests the combined features recited in the claims of the present application. For example, Lee, Tanaka and the Ohta article fail to teach or suggest a method for discharging an in-plane switching mode liquid crystal display panel that includes, among other features, “forming a liquid crystal display panel by providing a liquid crystal layer between the color filter and thin film transistor substrates; subsequently discharging at least one surface of the liquid crystal display panel using an ionizer system ” as recited in amended, independent claim 1.

In the present application, as recited in independent claim 1, discharging is performed on “at least one surface of the liquid crystal display panel” to prevent an electrostatic stain during a lighting test. Specifically, discharging in claim 1 is performed after forming the liquid crystal display panel. However, in Lee and Tanaka, discharging is performed on the thin film transistor substrate, i.e., before the TFT substrate and color filter substrate are attached. Thus, neither Lee nor Tanaka teach the combined features of the method recited in independent claim 1. Further, the Ohta article fails to teach or suggest features that would remedy the deficient teachings of Lee and Tanaka. As such, claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-3 are allowable over any combination of Lee, Tanaka and the Ohta article.

Lee, Tanaka and the Ohta article also fail to teach or suggest “a method for discharging an in-plane switching mode liquid crystal display device that includes, among other features “providing a liquid crystal layer between the color filter and thin film transistor substrates to form a liquid crystal display panel” and “subsequently discharging the thin film transistor substrate of the liquid crystal display panel” as recited in independent claim 6 and its dependent claim 7.

And, Lee, Tanaka and the Ohta article fail to teach or suggest a method for fabricating an in-plane switching mode liquid crystal display panel that includes, among other features, “forming a liquid crystal display panel by attaching the first substrate to the second substrate; and subsequently providing a discharging device for removing an electrostatic charge from the liquid crystal display panel” as recited in amended, independent claim 9 and its dependent claims 10-12.

Because Lee, Tanaka and the Ohta article fail to teach or suggest at least the above

features of claims 1, 6 and 9, claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-3, claim 6 and its dependent claim 7, and claim 9 and its dependent claims 11-12 are allowable over any combination of Lee, Tanaka and the Ohta article. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 15-18 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants elect not to rewrite claims 15-18 in independent form at this time to permit the Examiner an opportunity to reconsider the objection in view of the amendments and remarks presented in this Response. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

New claim 19 has been added to provide additional coverage for subject matter disclosed in the originally filed specification. Claim 19 is allowable over any combination of Lee, Tanaka and the Ohta article by virtue of its dependence from independent claim 9 and further in view of its own patentable features.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: August 29, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes
Valerie P. Hayes
Registration No.: 53,005
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant